APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,786	12/05/2003	Daniel S. Rokusek	IS01182TC	2285

			EXAMINER
23330	7590	09/07/2005	MANOHARAN, MUTHUSWAMY GANAPATHY

MOTOROLA, INC.
LAW DEPARTMENT
1303 E. ALGONQUIN ROAD
SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2683	

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/729,786	ROKUSEK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Muthuswamy G. Manoharan	2683	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 December 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>05 December 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/05/2003</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7-13, and 16-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Holmes et al. (hereinafter Holmes) (US 6,636,749) in view of Lilja et

al. (hereinafter Lilja) (US 5,991,640).

Regarding claim 1, Holmes teaches a method, comprising: providing a handset

(item 110 in Figure 2) coupled to interface with a docking station (item 104 in Figure 2),

initiating a communications session, wherein the communications session spans from

the handset to a remote communications device (item 127 in Figure 2) using a WPAN

communications link (Blue tooth module 106 in Figure 2; Col. 6, line 61), and out from

the remote communications device using a cellular link (Col. 6, lines 57-65); the handset

translating between the WPAN communications link and the cellular link (Col. 5, lines 7-

13, item 106 in Figure 5); if the handset is in the docked condition, the handset routing

an audio component through the docking station (item 106 in Figure 1; Col. 8, lines 18-

33); and if the handset is in the undocked condition, the handset routing the audio

component through the handset (item 106 in Figure 5; Col. 8,lines 59-62). Holmes fails

to teach the handset determining one of a docked condition and an undocked condition.

However, Lilja teaches in an analogous art, the handset determining one of a docked

condition and an undocked condition (Col. 3, lines 17-21). Therefore, it would be

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention to have the handset

determining one of a docked condition and an undocked condition. This modification

makes the system very user friendly by reducing the number of operations to be

performed by the operator of the vehicle.

Regarding claim 2, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim

1. Holmes further teaches wherein the WPAN communications link utilizes a Bluetooth

communications protocol (Col. 6, lines 25-27).

Regarding claim 3, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim

1. Holmes further teaches the handset discovering and coupling to the remote

communications device (item 127 in Figure 5) using the, WPAN communications (item

106 in Figure 5, Col. 6, lines 57-62) link.

Regarding claim 4, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim

1. Holmes further teaches, wherein the docking station is integrated with a vehicle (item

102 in Figure 2, Col. 4, line 12).

Regarding claim 7, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim

1. Holmes further teaches, initiating the communications session using a human

interface element on the handset (Col. 4, lines 41-47).

Regarding claim 8, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim

1. Holmes further teaches, initiating the communications session using the handset

(Col. 4, lines 41-47).

Regarding claim 9, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim

1. Holmes further teaches, initiating the communications session comprises the handset

receiving a communication session request from the remote communications device

(Col. 4, lines 41-47).

Regarding claim 10, Holmes teaches a handset (item 110 in Figure 2) coupled to

interface with a docking station, comprising a computer-readable medium containing

computer instructions for instructing a processor to perform a method of controlling a

communications session, the instructions comprising (Col. 3, lines 46-65): initiating the

communications session, wherein the communications session spans from the handset

to a remote communications device using a WPAN communications link (Bluetooth

module 106 in Figure 2; Col. 6, line 61), and out from the remote communications

device using a cellular link (Col. 6, lines 57-65); the handset translating between the

WPAN communications link and the cellular link (Col. 5, lines 7-13, item 106 in Figure

5); if the handset is in the docked condition, the handset routing an audio component

through the docking station (item 106 in Figure 1, Col. 8, lines 18-33); and if the handset

is in the undocked condition, the handset routing the audio component through the

handset (item 106 in Figure 5; Col. 8, lines 59-62). Holmes fails to teach the handset

determining one of a docked condition and an undocked condition. However, Lilja

teaches in an analogous art, the handset determining one of a docked condition and an

undocked condition (Col. 3, lines 17-21). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time invention to have the handset determining one of a

docked condition and an undocked condition. This modification makes the system very

user friendly by reducing the number of operations to be performed by the operator of the vehicle.

Regarding claim 11, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 10. Holmes further teaches wherein the WPAN communications link utilizes a Bluetooth communications protocol (Col. 6, lines 25-27).

Regarding claim 12, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 10. Holmes further teaches the handset discovering and coupling to the remote communications device (item 127 in Figure 5) using the, WPAN communications (item 106 in Figure 5, Col. 6, lines 57-62) link.

Regarding claim 13, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 10. Holmes further teaches, wherein the docking station is integrated with a vehicle (item 102 in Figure 2, Col. 4, line 12).

Regarding claim 16, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 10. Holmes further teaches, initiating the communications session using a human interface element on the handset (Col. 4, lines 41-47).

Regarding claim 17, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 10. Holmes further teaches, initiating the communications session using the handset (Col. 4, lines 41-47).

Regarding claim 18, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 10. Holmes further teaches, initiating the communications session comprises the handset receiving a communications session request from the remote communications device (Col. 4, lines 41-47).

Claims 5,6,14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmes in view of Lilja and further in view of Huh et al. (hereinafter Huh) (US 2003/0008680).

Regarding claim 5, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 1. Neither Holmes nor Lilja teaches the handset is in the docked condition, initiating the communications session via voice recognition algorithm in one of the docking station and the handset. However, Huh teaches the handset is in the docked condition, initiating the communications session via voice recognition algorithm in one of the docking station and the handset (Abstract, lines 15-18; Paragraph [0055], lines 23-26). Therefore, it would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the process of initiating the communications session via voice recognition algorithm in one of the docking station and the handset. This modification makes the handset a truly hands-free car kit and also provides a user-friendly access to the handset.

Regarding claim 6, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 1. Neither Holmes nor Lilja teaches the handset is in the docked condition, one of the docking station and the handset executing a noise reduction algorithm during the communications session. However, Huh teaches the handset is in the docked condition, one of the docking station and the handset executing a noise reduction algorithm during the communications session (Paragraph [0014], lines 5-10, Paragraph [0072], lines 42-47). Therefore, it would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the handset is in the docked condition, one of the docking

station and the handset executing a noise reduction algorithm during the communications session. This modification improves the quality of the audio signals.

Regarding claim 14, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 10. Neither Holmes nor Lilja teaches the handset is in the docked condition, initiating the communications session via voice recognition algorithm in one of the docking station and the handset. However, Huh teaches the handset is in the docked condition, initiating the communications session via voice recognition algorithm in one of the docking station and the handset (Abstract, lines 15-18; Paragraph [0055], lines 23-26). This modification makes the handset a truly hands-free car kit and also provides a user-friendly access to the handset.

Regarding claim 15, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 10. Neither Holmes nor Lilja teaches the handset is in the docked condition, one of the docking station and the handset executing a noise reduction algorithm during the communications session. However, Huh teaches the handset is in the docked condition, one of the docking station and the handset executing a noise reduction algorithm during the communications session (Paragraph [0014], lines 5-10, Paragraph [0072], lines 42-47). This modification improves the quality of the audio signals.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Muthuswamy G. Manoharan whose telephone number is 571-272-5515. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 571-272-7872. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600